

REMARKS

In the Office Action¹, the Examiner objected to claims 6-14 and 20-23; rejected claims 1, 2, and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,800,667 to Kosaki et al. ("*Kosaki*"), in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0179353 to Yamauchi et al. ("*Yamauchi*"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,976,331 to Chang et al. ("*Chang*"); and rejected claims 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Yamauchi*, *Kosaki*, and *Chang*.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 7-12, 15, 17, 20, 22, and 23, and canceled claims 6 and 21 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-5, 7-20, and 22-25 are pending, and claims 24 and 25 have been withdrawn.

Applicants confirm the oral election of Group 1, characterized by the Examiner as corresponding to claims 1-23, by David W. Hill on December 18, 2008.

Regarding the objection to claims 6-14 and 20-23, Applicants have amended claims 7-14, 20, 22, and 23 to remove any improper multiple dependency. Therefore, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner states, "[t]he claim limitation 'liquid crystal wax' is indefinite" (Office Action at page 3). Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the claimed "liquid crystal wax" is used as an adhesive or a wax with liquid crystal qualities. The Examiner also states, "[t]he claim limitation 'high flatness' is

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

indefinite” (Office Action at page 4). Although Applicants do not agree with the Examiner’s statements, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 2 to remove “high.” Applicants submit that claims 1, 2, and 15-17 meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Applicants respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Claim 1 recites a method including, for example:

holding the thin plate and the planar member vertically opposite to each other with their joining surfaces extended in flatness respectively on first and second holding members capable of moving in directions along an X-axis, a Y-axis and a Z-axis and of turning in a Θ -direction relative to each other;

. . . .

wherein the first holding member holds the thin plate by suction.

(emphasis added).

Kosaki discloses a method “for adhering a wafer to a supporting substrate with improved adhesion accuracy” (col. 2, lines 16-17). However, *Kosaki* does not teach or suggest the claimed “wherein the first holding member holds the thin plate by suction,” as recited in claim 1.

Yamauchi does not cure the deficiencies of *Kosaki*. *Yamauchi* discloses an alignment device constructed by adjusting a table holding an object (paragraph 0006). However, *Yamauchi* does not teach or suggest the claimed “wherein the first holding member holds the thin plate by suction,” as recited in claim 1.”

Chang does not cure the deficiencies of *Kosaki* and *Yamauchi*. *Chang* discloses “an electrodeposition apparatus for use in depositing one or more metal or conductive

layers" (col. 2, lines 14-16). However, *Chang* does not teach or suggest the claimed "wherein the first holding member holds the thin plate by suction," as recited in claim 1."

Accordingly, *Kosaki*, *Yamauchi*, and *Chang* fail to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 1. Claims 7-14 depend from claim 1 and are thus also allowable over *Kosaki*, *Yamauchi*, and *Chang* for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Independent claims 2, 15, and 17, while of different scope, are also allowable over *Kosaki*, *Yamauchi*, and *Chang*. Claims 3-5, 16, 18-20, 22, and 23 are also allowable at least due to their dependence from independent claims 2, 15, and 17, respectively.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and withdrawal of the rejection. The pending claims are in condition for allowance, and Applicants request a favorable action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 4, 2009

By: /David W. Hill/
David W. Hill
Reg. No. 28,220